

REMARKS

This response is submitted, along with a request for continued examination, in reply to the outstanding final Office Action dated August 18, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated November 3, 2008. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's thorough examination of the application as evidenced by the Office Action. All claims pending at the time of examination (i.e., claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 35) currently stand rejected.

The final Office Action indicates that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30, 31, and 35 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,183, hereinafter "Satran") in view of Stapleton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,875, hereinafter "Stapleton"), further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,285 hereinafter Lee). Claims 8, 9, 23, and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran in view of Stapleton and Lee, and in further in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,983, hereinafter "Haggerty").

As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from cited references, taken individually or in any proper combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims, including pending independent claims 1, 6, 15, and 21, and added new claims 39-42 to further clarify the claimed invention. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30, 31, and 35 are Patentable

As stated above, the Office Action rejects all the claims as being unpatentable for being obvious in light of Satran, Stapleton and Lee, or in light of Satran, Stapleton, Lee and Haggerty. According to one aspect of the claimed invention, independent claim 1, and similarly independent 15, recites, *inter alia*, "filtering, in the routing unit, the multicast data packets in accordance with the specific parameters for each receiver of the

multicast group to obtain filtered multicast data packets individualized for the respective receivers; and transmitting, by the routing unit, the individualized filtered multicast data packets to the addresses of the respective receivers.” Similarly, independent claim 6, and similarly independent claim 21, recites, *inter alia*, “filtering, in the routing unit, the addresses of the receiver list in accordance with the specific parameters to obtain filtered receiver addresses, the filtered receiver addresses being a subset of the receiver addresses included in the multicast group; and transmitting, by the routing unit, the multicast data packets to respective addresses included in the filtered receiver addresses.” The amendments to the independent claims clarify that the results of the filtering operations (e.g., data packets individualized for the respective receivers) are individually addressed and transmitted to appropriate receivers.

The Office Action relies upon the disclosure of Satran as support for the obviousness rejections of the pending independent claims. However, neither Satran, nor a combination of Satran with any of cited references, teaches or suggests the transmission of individually addressed packets as claimed.

In this regard, Satran describes a multicast packet-switched system where packets are transmitted from a plurality of transmitters, multiplexed, and then transmitted as multicast addressed packets to a multicast group of receivers. As a result, the same data packets are received by all members of the multicast group in Satran. Any filtering of the multicast addressed packets is performed at the receivers after receipt of the multicast addressed packets. (Col. 5, Lines 26-27). As such, the packets of Satran are generated as multicast addressed packets at a multiplexer and transmitted as multicast packets to the multicast group. Therefore, unlike the claimed invention, all members of the multicast group receive the same data packets addressed to the entire multicast group, rather than individually addressed data packets that have possibly been individualized for each of the receivers. As a result, the claimed elements are not taught or suggested by Satran, or Satran in combination with the cited references, and therefore the claimed elements would not be a predictable result of the disclosure of Satran, or a combination of Satran with any of the cited references.

As such, Applicants assert that the rejections of independent claims 1, 6, 15, and 21 are overcome and the claims are in condition for allowance, based at least on the remarks provided above. Since defendant claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, and 31 include all the recitations of their respective independent claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of the dependent claims are also overcome and the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

New Claims 39-42

Applicants have added new independent claims 39-42 to clarify aspects of the present application. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application. New claims 39-42 include similar recitations to those described above with respect to claim 1, and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for including additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references, taken alone or in a proper combination.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required

Appl. No.: 10/049,590
Amdt. Dated 10/17/2008
Reply to Office Action of 08/18/2008

therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Quirk
Registration No. 60,676

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/31025874v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON November 18, 2008.